

REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

Claims 3-6, 8, 12-14, and 26 are pending in this application. Claims 3, 4, 14, and 26 stand rejected. Claims 5, 6, 8, 12, and 13 stand objected to, but would be allowable if rewritten in independent form, including all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims.

In this paper, claims 5 and 26 have been cancelled without prejudice, claims 3, 6, 8, 12, and 14 have been amended, and claims 27 and 28 have been added. Claim 27 is claim 12 rewritten in independent form, including all of the limitations of base claim 26. Claim 28 is claim 5 rewritten in independent form, including all of the limitations of base claim 26.

Applicant believes the amendments made herein add no new matter. Any amendments to the claims which have been made in this amendment, and which have not been specifically noted to overcome a rejection based on prior art, should be considered to have been made for a purpose unrelated to patentability, and no estoppel should be deemed to be attached thereto. Reconsideration and reexamination of the application is respectfully requested in view of the amendments and the following remarks.

Rejection Under 35 U.S.C. §112, ¶2

Claim 14 stands rejected under 35 U.S.C. §112, ¶2, as allegedly indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention. The rejection is traversed.

The Examiner asserts that, in claim 14, "the normal range of movement" in lines 3-5 lacks proper antecedent basis.

Claim 14 has been amended to change "the normal range of movement" to "a normal range of travel." Applicants believe the amendment resolves the antecedent basis issue. Applicants request withdrawal of the rejection, and the allowance of claim 14.

Rejection Under 35 U.S.C. §102(b)

Claims 14 and 26 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(b) as allegedly anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 3,339,877 to Valenzuela. The rejection is traversed.

Claim 26 has been cancelled without prejudice. Thus, the rejection is moot as to claim 26. By amendment, claim 14 now depends from claim 27, which, as discussed above, is allowable. Thus, claim 14 is allowable.

Applicants request withdrawal of the rejection of claims 14 and 26, and the allowance of claim 14.

Claims 14 and 26 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(b) as allegedly anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 4,158,483 to Fisher et al. The rejection is traversed.

Claim 26 has been cancelled without prejudice. Thus, the rejection is moot as to claim 26. By amendment, claim 14 now depends from claim 27, which, as discussed above, is allowable. Thus, claim 14 is allowable.

Applicants request withdrawal of the rejection of claims 14 and 26, and the allowance of claim 14.

Rejection Under 35 U.S.C. §103(a)

Claims 3 and 4 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as allegedly unpatentable over Valenzuela '877. The rejection is traversed.

By amendment, claims 3 and 4 now depend from claim 27, which, as discussed above, is allowable. Thus, claims 3 and 4 are allowable.

Applicants request withdrawal of the rejection, and the allowance of claims 3 and 4.

Serial No. 10/707,567
Filed: December 22, 2003
Page 7 of 7

Examiner: Ricky D. Shafer
Group Art Unit: 2872

CONCLUSION

It is respectfully submitted that all of the claims in the application are allowable over the prior art of record. Prompt notification of allowability is respectfully requested. If there are any remaining issues which the Examiner believes may be resolved in an interview, the Examiner is respectfully invited to contact the undersigned.

Respectfully submitted,

IAN BODDY ET AL.

Dated: November 13, 2007

By: /Michael F Kelly/

G. Thomas Williams, Reg. No. 42,228
Michael F. Kelly, Reg. No. 50,859
MCGARRY BAIR PC
32 Market Avenue, S.W., Suite 500
Grand Rapids, Michigan 49503
(616) 742-3500
mfk@mcgarrybair.com

G0333076.DOC